



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,537	01/04/2002	Dietrich W. Schultz	109476-080UTL	9387
27189	7590	11/04/2008	EXAMINER	
PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP			VAUGHN, GREGORY J	
530 B STREET				
SUITE 2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101			2178	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/04/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@procopio.com  
PTONotifications@procopio.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/039,537	SCHULTZ ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	GREGORY J. VAUGHN	2178	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) GREGORY J. VAUGHN. (3) Dietrich Schultz (applicant).  
 (2) Patricia J. Rawlins (applicant's representative). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 28 October 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bernardo et al., US Patent 6,684,369; Ackerman et al., US Patent 6,606,653; and Smith et al., US Patent 6,578,078.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner and applicant discussed the claimed invention in light of the cited prior art of record. Agreement with respect to the claims was not reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Gregory J. Vaughn/ Examiner, Art Unit 2178	
--	--